

The 7th October, 1968

No. 4535-RIII-68/2852.—in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 2(a) (ia) & 3(IA) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to make a grant of war jagir of the annual value of Rs 100 each (Rupees one hundred only) in favour of the under mentioned persons subject to such conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in the respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them :—

Serial No.	Name of the Grantee	Particulars of the Grantee		
		Village	Tehsil	District
1	Shri Siri Chand, son of Shri Hazari	Naulatha	Panipat	Karnal
2	Shrimati Sahai Devi, widow of Shri Surain Singh	Shirifgarh	Thanesar	Karnal
3	Shri Bhagwan Dass, son of Shri Ather Mal	Q. No. 70, Prem Nagar, Karnal	Karnal	Karnal

These grants will take effect from Kharif, 1965.

No. 4302-RIII-68/2857.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 2(a) (ia) & 3(IA) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, The Governor of Haryana is pleased to make a grant of war Jagir of the annual value as shown against each in the favour of the following persons subject to such condition as to its enjoyment as are contained in the respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them :—

Serial No.	District	Name of the grantee	Particulars of grantee		Value of Jagir	Crops and year from which the Jagir will take place
			Village	Tehsil		
1.	Ambala	Shri Parbhu Singh, son of Shri Jaimal Singh	Laton	Naraingarh colony	Rs. 140	Kharif, 1965
2.	Do	Shrimati Kishan Kaur widow of Shri Ishar Singh	Raiwali	Do	100	Kharif, 1965
3.	Do	Shri Bishan Singh, son of Shri Bhagwan Singh	Laha	Do	100	Rabi, 1966

KIRAN PREM, Dy. Secy.

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH**

The 25th September, 1968

No. 2(125)G/164-R.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that land specified below is needed by Government, at public expenses, for a public purpose, namely, for constructing Link Road from Jind-Narwana Road to village Ghogarian, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the aforesaid section/purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section VI of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provision of section 7 of the said Act, the Collector, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Haryana, Ambala Cantt. is hereby directed to take orders for the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Haryana, Ambala Cantt. and Executive Engineer, P. W. D., B. & R./Provincial Division, Jind.

## SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Description
Jind	Narwana	Baroda	7.62	As demarcated at site.
Do	Do	Roskhera	6.52	
Do	Do	Ghogarian	2.40	
Total			16.54	

(Sd.) . . .

Executive Engineer,  
Jind Provincial Division.**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH**

The 9th October, 1968

No. 5760-PWIII-(3)-68/24621.—On his promo-

tion as officiating Executive Engineer, Shri Chand Kirhore Puri assumed charge of the Dadri Provincial Division on the forenoon of 29th August, 1968 relieving Shri H. R. Sehgal.

**IRRIGATION BRANCH**

The 7th October, 1968

No. 11044-IPWI-68/24331.—It is notified for general information that Shri C. D. Sachdev, H.S.E. (I) Superintending Engineer, Irrigation Branch, Haryana, retired from Government service on 2nd August, 1968 (afternoon) on attaining the age of 58 years.

P. N. BHALLA, Secy.

**LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

The 21st August, 1968

No. 7938-2Lab-68/21517.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (I) of section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Central Act XI of 1948), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to make the following amendment in Haryana Government Labour Department Notification No. 1269-2Lab-68/4755, dated 24th February, 1968:—

For "Shri Darshan Singh, General Secretary, Faridabad General Engineering Workers Union, Faridabad (A. I. T. U. C.)", the name of "Shri Kamal Dev Kapil, M. L. A., Faridabad", shall be substituted.

No. 7938-2Lab-68/21522.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Central Act XI of 1948), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to extend the term of period of the Advisory Committee constituted to hold enquiries and advise the Government for fixing minimum rates of wages in respect of employment in Potteries, Ceramics and Refractory Industry—vide notification No. 11199-2Lab-67/285, dated 19th December, 1967 by 2 months more, i.e., up to 18th October, 1968.

The 4th October, 1968

**AWARD**

No. 9100-3Lab-68/24797.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Haryana, Chandigarh, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Mohan Spinning Mills, Rohtak.

An industrial dispute having come into existence between the workmen and the management of M/s Mohan Spinning Mills, Rohtak, the same was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal under clause (d) of sub-section 1 of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, vide Haryana Government Notification No. 505-SF-III-Lab-67/33025, dated 8th November, 1967. The various items of dispute as mentioned in the said notification are as under:—

1. Whether the workmen should be granted dearness allowance? If so, with what details and from which date?
2. Whether the percentage of permanent workmen be increased in the establishment. If so, with what details?
3. Whether the termination of Shri Zile Singh and Ved Parkash was justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

BEFORE SHRI K. L. GOSAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH.

Reference No. 100 of 1967

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MOHAN SPINNING MILLS, ROHTAK

Present : Shri B. R. Ghaiye and Shri Kailash Sarup Bhatnagar, for the management.  
Shir R. K. Bhasker, for the workmen.

4. Whether the workmen be granted bonus for the year 1965-66 ? If so with what details ?
5. Whether Mali and Sweeper working in the establishment should be made permanent and provided with attendance cards ? If so from which date and with what details ?
6. Whether oilmen and machine cleaners should be provided with uniforms and washing allowance ? If so from which date and with what details ?

On receipt of the reference in this Tribunal usual notices were issued to the parties and in response to the same the workmen filed their statement of claims and the management filed their written statement to the same. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to as many as 10 issues which were framed on 17th February, 1968, and which are as under:—

1. Was any settlement entered into between the management and the Mohan Spinning Mill Mazdoor Union on 4th July, 1967 ? If so, what are its terms and how does it affect the present reference ?
2. Is the concern in question not liable to pay bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 ?
3. Is the dispute in question not an industrial dispute for reasons stated in paras 3 and 4 of the preliminary objection in the written statement ?
4. Cannot the claim for Dearness Allowance be adjudicated in this reference for reasons stated in paragraph 5 of the preliminary objection of the written statement ?
5. Whether the workmen should be granted dearness allowance ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
6. Whether the percentage of permanent workmen be increased in the establishment ? If so with what details ?
7. Whether the termination of Shri Zile Singh and Shri Ved Parkash was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief are they entitled ?
8. Whether the workmen be granted bonus for the year 1965-66 ? If so with what details ?
9. Whether Mali and Sweeper working in the establishment should be made permanent and provided with attendance cards ? If so from which date and with what details ?
10. Whether oilmen and machine cleaners should be provided with uniforms and washing allowance ? If so, from which date and with what details ?

Parties were directed to produce their evidence in respect of the said issues and on conclusion of their evidence their representatives were given opportunity to address their arguments to me. My findings on the various issues are as under:—

Issues Nos. 1 and 4.—These two issues relate to the same point and can be conveniently disposed of together. The case of the management is that the workmen of the concern had previously a union which was known as The Mohan Spinning Mills Mazdoor Union. The said union served a charter of demands on the management inter-alia making a demand for enhancement of wages. A settlement was arrived at

between the management and the said union and the same was reduced to writing and is Ex. R. 8. By the said settlement the wages of the workmen were enhanced. A clause in the said settlement provided that "the above increase is given to meet the increased cost of living as given from time to time in the past and will be treated as part of dearness allowance for all practical purposes". Another clause said that the settlement regarding dearness allowance will be binding on the parties for a period of three years, i.e., up to 4th July, 1970. The case of the management is that the demand for dearness allowance now raised in item No. 1 of the dispute cannot be adjudicated in the present reference as the said demand could not possibly be made till 4th July, 1970 because of the previous settlement Ex. R. 8. The case of the workmen on the other hand is that the previous settlement was made with a puppet union and was a mala fide transaction. I have carefully gone through the evidence led by both the parties in respect of their allegations. The management have proved the previous settlement by the evidence of their Labour Officer R.W. 1 as also by the evidence of R.W. 7 who was the Central Secretary of the Mohan Spinning Mill Mazdoor Union at the relevant time. The workmen have examined A.W. 1 Ved Parkash who is Secretary of the new union of the workmen. This witness has stated that the new union came into existence sometimes in June, 1967, but was registered in the beginning of July, 1967. He has alleged that the new union had sent a demand notice to the management in June, 1967, and the management thereafter manipulated the settlement Ex. R. 8 with the union which was not in existence at that time. Copy of the demand notice alleged to have been sent in June, 1967 has not been produced by the workmen. On the other hand the demand notice which accompanies the reference and which was given by the said union is dated 22nd August, 1967 and it was not denied during the course of arguments that the notice referred to by Ved Parkash A.W. 1 was the same. It is difficult to believe the version of the workmen that the settlement dated 4th July, 1967 was made with a puppet union. R.W. 7 has clearly stated that the previous union was then in existence and at the relevant time it had 446 members out of the total of 575 workmen employed in the concern. He has further stated that the said union has still 422 workmen as their members. This settlement is in my opinion binding on the members of the previous union but it is not denied that it is not binding on those who were not the members of the said union. The settlement was not admittedly made in the course of conciliation proceedings and can only be binding on the parties to the same vide sub-section 1 of Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The said settlement cannot, therefore, bar the adjudication of the item No. 1 of the present dispute in so far as it relates to workmen who were not the members of the previous union. The aforesaid two issues are decided accordingly.

Issue No. 2.—The case of the management is that the mill in question went into production for the first time on 28th August, 1963 and till the accounting year for which the bonus is claimed it did not earn any profits. It is urged on behalf of the management that the establishment having been newly set up, the em-

ployees of this establishment are not entitled to be paid bonus either under Clause (a) or under Clause (b) of Sub-section 1 of Section 16 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. It is not denied by the workmen that the establishment in question had been newly set up and they were not entitled to claim bonus either under clause (a) or under clause (b) of sub-section 1 of Section 16. It was, however, urged on their behalf that they were entitled to be paid bonus under proviso to sub-section 2 of the aforesaid Section. This plea was never taken by them in their statement of claims or in their demand notice. Moreover they have led no evidence to prove that the employers were paying bonus to the employees either of the new department or of the undertakings before 29th May, 1965. The plea of the management in these circumstances must be upheld and issue No. 2 must be and is decided in their favour.

Issue No. 3.—This issue is based on two pleas of the management one of which was raised by them in para 3 of the preliminary objections in their written statement and the other in para 4 of the said preliminary objections. So far as their first plea in para 3 of the written statement is concerned it has no merits and Mr. Ghaiye who represented the management during the course of arguments very rightly did not press the same. The objection taken in para 4 is that by its very nature the dispute in question is not an industrial dispute. After giving my careful consideration to the matter I have no hesitation in upholding this objection. The dispute raised is that the management should be asked to have a higher percentage of workmen in their permanent cadre. It is not claimed that any particular workmen are entitled to the permanent cadre nor is it claimed that any particular workmen are not being made permanent in spite of the fact that they deserve to be so. Obviously the management is the best Judge of deciding how many persons they would keep in permanent cadre and till that decision is held to be arbitrary or against the terms of the employment of certain workmen, industrial adjudication cannot interfere with the same. The dispute raised is in an abstract form and does not in my opinion fall within the ambit of the definition of the word 'Industrial dispute' as given in Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The issue is decided in favour of the management.

Issue No. 5.—The only evidence which the workmen have led in respect of this issue consists of two witnesses Chander Sain Gupta and Hari Ram A.W. 2 and A.W. 3, respectively. The first of them is an employee of T.I.T. Mills, Bhiwani and the second of them is an ex-employee of Delhi Cloth Mill. Each of them has stated that same D.A. is being paid by their Mills. The wages in the present mill are, however, consolidated and the evidence of R.W. 4, R.W. 8 and R.W. 9 shows that the present mill is paying much higher wages than similar mills in Abohar, Faridabad and Malaut. R.W. 4 is the employee of Abohar Mills and has stated that the unskilled workmen in his mill are being paid wages at the rate of Rs. 88.17 p.m. R.W. 8 is an employee of Usha Spinning and Weaving Mills, Faridabad and has stated that the total wages drawn by unskilled workmen in his mills amount to Rs. 80.86 per month. He has also stated that in Jawala Textile

Mills, Gurgaon the wages paid to the unskilled persons are Rs. 91 per month. R.W. 9 is an employee of Malaut Mills and has stated that the unskilled workmen in that mill are getting wages at the rate of Rs. 72.50 per month. The mill in question is paying wages at the rate of Rs. 3.65 per day to each of their unskilled workmen and the monthly wages work out to be Rs. 94.90. The evidence of P.W. 4 is supported by A.W. 4 and evidence of R.W. 9 is supported by R.W. 9.1 The evidence led by the management shows that the wages paid by this mill are higher than those paid in the comparable units in the region. The workmen have totally failed to prove their claim for enhancement of wages or for being allowed any dearness allowance over and above the consolidated wages which they are already getting. As observed above the mill is a new undertaking and ever since its inception it has been suffering losses vide their balance sheets R-9, R-10 and R-11. The workmen have failed to prove that the concern in question is able to bear the burden of any increase in wages. For the aforesaid reason this issue is decided against the workmen and their demand for the dearness allowance is dismissed.

Issue No. 6.—Apart from the fact that I have already held that the dispute in question is not an industrial dispute, I find that there are no merits in the dispute. The workmen have given no basis for their claim that the percentage of permanent workmen be increased. They have not even cared to prove the present number of permanent workmen or to bring any evidence on record to show how many permanent posts the management must have. The issue is decided against the workmen and their demand covered by the said issue is dismissed.

Issue No. 7.—It appears that Zile Singh has been reinstated or re-employed by the concern during the course of this case. During the course of arguments Mr. Bhasker who represented the workmen stated before me that the workmen concerned did not claim any relief in respect of Zile Singh. Ved Parkash was dismissed by the management after a domestic enquiry into certain charges had been held by R.W. 1 the Labour Officer of the concern. R.W. 1 proved the charge sheet Ex. R. 1 and produced the record of enquiry and gave his evidence that the enquiry was made in accordance with the rules of natural justice. Although he was cross-examined on other points, no question was put to him in cross-examination with regard to the case of Ved Parkash or the domestic enquiry and gave his evidence that the enquiry was made self has not cared to come in the witness box and the workmen have not led any other evidence with regard to his dismissal. The issue is in these circumstances decided in favour of the management and the demand covered by the said issue is dismissed.

Issue No. 8.—While deciding issue No. 2, I have already held that the workmen are not entitled to claim bonus for the year in question and that Section 16 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, exempts the establishment in question from payment of bonus under the said Act. The issue is accordingly decided in favour of the management and the claim of the workmen covered by this item is dismissed.

Issue No. 9.—No evidence has been led in support of this issue and it was frankly conceded by Mr.

Bhaskar, representative of the workmen, that the demand in question had not been established. The issue is, therefore, decided against the workmen and their claim covered by the said issue is dismissed.

Issue No. 10.—This issue related to two categories of workmen which are (1) oilmen and (2) machine cleaners. During the course of arguments Mr. B. R. Ghaiye who represented the management informed me that oilmen had been provided with uniforms during the course of this case. This was also admitted by Mr. Bhaskar who represented the workmen. With respect to the machine cleaners the workmen have relied upon the evidence of A. W. 4, Shri Ram Kailash who has firmly stated as under :—

“Ring machine cleaners in Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani get uniforms. Cleaners of other departments are also provided with uniforms. We have to clean the machines and to put oil in the machine.”

The management examined Shri K. D. Yaiyat, Factory Manager, Jawala Textile Mills, Gurgaon, to prove that cleaners in his mills were not being provided with any uniforms. He, however, admitted that the clothes of cleaners also get soiled though not to the same extent as of the oilmen. In view of the evidence of the aforesaid two witnesses Mr. B. R. Ghaiye did not seriously dispute the claim of the workmen for uniforms being provided to the cleaners of the machines and it was stated at the bar that there were only 16 such cleaners employed in the concern in question. In Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani, each cleaner is provided with two khaki

shirts and two khaki half-pants each year. Mr. Ghaiye stated at the bar that similar uniforms had been provided to the oilmen. He stated that the management would perhaps have no objection in providing similar uniforms to the 16 machine cleaners. For the reasons given above I direct the management to provide uniforms to all the cleaners of the machines (who are stated to be 16 in number). The said uniforms will consist of two shirts and two half-pants of khaki drill to each of them in each year. These uniforms will be provided by the management within two months from the date of the publication of this award in the official gazette.

No order as to costs.

K. L. GOSAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Chandigarh.

Dated : 13th September, 1968.

No. 1088, dated Chandigarh, the 20th September, 1968.

The award be submitted to the Secretary to Government, Chandigarh, as required by Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

K. L. GOSAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Chandigarh.

No. 9138-3Lab-68/24800.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Chandigarh, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Bhupindra Cement Works, Surajpur :—

BEFORE SHRI K. L. GOSAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
CHANDIGARH

Reference No. 31 of 1968

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHUPINDRA CEMENT WORKS,  
SURAJPUR

Present :—Shri I. M. Nanawati, for the management.

Shri G. C. Joshi, for Bhupindra Cement Karamchhari Union, Surajpur.

Shri Om Parkash, for Bhupindra Cement Workers Union, Surajpur.

#### AWARD

An industrial dispute having come into existence between the workmen and the management of M/s Bhupindra Cement Works, Surajpur, the same was referred for adjudication to this tribunal under clause (d) of sub-section(1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, —vide Haryana Government Notification No. ID/UMB/77A-68/10787, dated 22nd April, 1968. The dispute as mentioned in the notification comprises the following three items :—

- (1) (a) Whether the existing incentive bonus rates for packing department should be revised/increased? If so, with what details and from which date ?
- (b) Whether the existing incentive bonus payable to Mazdoor working in loading wagons and coal gypsum, etc., should be revised/increased ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
- (2) Whether the Chaprasies should be given the same grades and scales of pay and facilities as being given to the peons. If so, with what details and from which date ?
- (3) Whether the clerks working in the factory should be treated at par with the clerks working the Accounts and General office and whether they should be paid any extra allowance for working more hours than office clerk. If so, with what details and from which date ?

On receipt of the reference in this tribunal usual notices were issued to the parties and in response to the same the two unions of the workmen filed their statements of claims and the management filed their written statement to the same. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to three issues only which were precisely the same as the three items of dispute. Parties were called upon to lead their evidence in respect of the said issues. After a part of the evidence had been led, the parties arrived at a mutual settlement of the dispute and reduced the same to writing in the form of a settlement deed which was produced before me and which I marked as Ex. 'A'. The representatives of the parties made statements before me that they had arrived at a mutual settlement and that an award may be made in terms of the said settlement. For the reasons given above I make my award in terms of the deed of settlement Ex. 'A' which will be published along with this award and shall be treated as an annexure to and a part and parcel of the same.

No order as to costs.

Dated 20th September, 1968.

K. L. GOSAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Chandigarh.

No. 1091, dated Chandigarh, the 20th September, 1968.

The award (4 copies) be submitted to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required by section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

K. L. GOSAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Chandigarh.

#### ANNEXTURE

BEFORE SHRI K. L. GOSAIN, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

Reference No. 31 of 1968

between

THE ASSOCIATED CEMENT COS. LTD., BHUPENDRA CEMENT WORKS

AND

ITS WORKMEN

The workmen of the Associated Cement Cos. Ltd., Bhupendra Cement Works, as represented before this Hon'ble Tribunal in the above reference by the Bhupendra Cement Workers' Union and Bhupendra Cement Karamchhari Union and the management of the Company have settled all the demands as contained in the Order of Reference, dated 22nd April, 1968, on the terms indicated below :—

**1 0. Demand No. 1(a).** Whether the existing Incentive Bonus rates for Packing Department should be revised/increased ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

1.1. The parties agree that the present scheme of incentive bonus for packing plant workmen shall continue, subject to the change as mentioned in para 1.2 hereunder.

1.2. It is agreed that the present rate of incentive bonus earned by workmen shall be calculated every month as hitherto, and the amount of incentive bonus so arrived at shall be increased by 35%, and the payment to the workmen made accordingly. The said revision in the incentive scheme as stated in this para, shall be brought into force from 1st January, 1968.

**2 0. Demand No. 1(b).** Whether the existing incentive bonus payable to Mazdoors working in loading wagons and coal gypsum, etc., should be revised/increased ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

2.1. The parties agree that the present system of payment to coal unloading workmen shall continue, subject to the change as mentioned in para 2.2 below.

2.2. It is agreed that the present piece-rate of 15.5 paise per ton shall be increased to 21 paise per ton for unloading coal from the wagons (whether four-wheeler, or BOX). The said revision will be effective from 1st January, 1968.

**3.0. Demand No. 2.** Whether the Chaprasies should be given the same grade and scale of pay and facilities as being given to the peons ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

3.1. The Company agrees to promote the following Chaprasies from 'E' to 'D' Grade with immediate effect :—

- (1) Shri Prem Singh,
- (2) Shri Jagdish Chand,
- (3) Shri Gopal Singh,

4. Shri Teja Singh, and

5. Shri Bijay Singh.

4.0. Demand No. 3. Whether the Clerks working in the factory should be treated at par with the Clerks working in the Accounts and General Office and whether they should be paid any extra allowance for working more hours than Office Clerks ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

4.1. This demand is not pressed by the Unions for the present.

5.0. This settlement for Demand No. 1(a) and 1(b) will remain in force for a period of three years and shall continue even thereafter, until terminated by either party. The party desiring to terminate this settlement shall be required to give two months' notice in writing to the other party, and the settlement shall be deemed to be in operation until expiration of such notice.

6.0. During the period of this settlement, no dispute shall be raised or demand made on subjects covered by this settlement.

The said parties pray this Hon'ble Tribunal to pass an Award in terms of the above settlement.

Dated this sixteenth day of September, 1968.

For and on behalf of

1. Bhupendra Cement Workers' Union.

(Sd.) . . . ,

President

For and on behalf of  
The Associated Cement Cos., Ltd., Bhupendra Cement Works.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Manager.

2. Bhupendra Cement Karamchari Union.

(Sd.) . . . ,

General Secretary

Witnesses :

1. (Sd.) . . . ,

2. (Sd.) . . . ,

3. (Sd.) . . . ,

(Sd.) . . . ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Chandigarh.

No. 9060-3Lab-68/24874.- In exercise of the powers conferred under section 84 of the Factories Act, 1948, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to exempt the Military Farm, Ambala Cantt. from the provisions of section 83 of the said Act, and Rules 94-A and 95 of the Punjab Factory Rules, 1952, and to allow the said Military Farm to maintain the record of leave of the workers in Forms Nos. A. T. C. 4 and A. T. C. 2-A.

No. SO 98/CA/11 48S-5/68 20913.- In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Central Act 11 of 1948), the Governor of Haryana, after considering the advice of the committee appointed under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of the said section hereby revises, with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the official Gazette, the minimum rates of wages (all inclusive) fixed in respect of the employment in Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories. — vide erstwhile Punjab Government notification No. SO 496/CA XI/48/S-5/63 26219, dated the 30th November, 1963, as follows :—

Sr. No.	Category of Workers	All inclusive minimum rates of wages per mensem
<b>Un-skilled</b>		
1.	Mazdoo - Casual Labourer	Rs 85.00 per mensem or Rs 3.40 per day
2.	Chowkidar	
3.	Mali	
4.	Peon	

		All inclusive minimum wages per mensem
5.	Women employed for wholetime in Zafri work	Rs 0.22 P. per Kilogram plus Rs 1.50 per day
6.	Women Labourer employed for picking work (Part-time) and Ginning (Part-time) work	
Semi-skilled Category I		
1.	Steam Engine Driver	Rs 125.00 per mensem
2.	Press Engine Driver	
3.	Cobbler (Mochi)	
Semi-skilled Category II		
1.	Oil man	Rs 100.00 per mensem
2.	Coal man	
3.	Press O man	
4.	Ginning Oil man	
5.	Boiler Fire man	
Skilled		
1.	Engineer Class III	Rs 150.00 per mensem
2.	Ginning Fitter (Single Roller) Grade II	
3.	Car Driver (Other than Private Car Drivers)	
4.	Truck Driver	
Clerical Staff		
1.	Clerk (Under Matric)	Rs 95.00 per mensem
2.	Clerk (Matriculate)	Rs 100.00 per mensem
3.	neem/Senior Clerk (Graduate)	Rs 125.00 per mensem
4.	Accountant/Cashier	Rs 160.00 per mensem

*Note.*—Wherever any of the above category of workmen are engaged/employed through a contractor, the occupier will be personally responsible for ensuring the payment of the minimum rates of wages by his contractor.

The 9th October, 1968

No. SO 99/CA/11/48/S-5/68/8971-2Lab/23997.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Central Act XI of 1948), the Governor of Haryana, after considering the advice of the committee appointed under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of the said section, hereby revises, with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the official Gazette, the minimum rates of wages (all inclusive) fixed in respect of the employment in Saw Mills and Timber Trade Industry,—vide erstwhile Punjab Government notification No. S. O./489/CA/11/48/S-5/63, dated the 28th November, 1963, as follows.—

Sr. No.	Category of Wk	All inclusive minimum wages per mensem
I. Unskilled (Saw Mills)		
1.	Mazdoor	Rs 30.00 per mensem or 3.50 per day
2.	Chowkidar	
3.	Peon	
4.	M	
5.	Casual Labourer	
Semi-skilled Category I		
1.	Assistant Mistry	Rs 120.00 per mensem



# **PART I] HARYANA GOVT G**

Sr. No.	Category of Workers	All inclusive minimum wages per mensem	
II. Semi-skilled Category II			
1. 2. 3. 4.	Cutterman Helper Boiler Firemen Assistant Planner Mistry	Rs 105.00 per mensem	
III. Skilled			
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Band Saw Mistry Supervisor Head Mistry Bioler Driver Car/Truck Driver		Rs 150.00 per mensem Rs 140.00 per mensem
IV. Clerical Staff			
1. 2. 3. 4.	Clerk (up to Matric) Clerk (Graduate) Accountant/Cashier Accountant (duly qualified)	Rs 100.00 per mensem Rs 120.00 per mensem Rs 130.00 per mensem Rs 175.00 per mensem	
TIMBER TRADE			
i. Unskilled			
1. 2. 3. 4.	Mali Chowkidar Peon Casual Labourer	Rs 90.00 per mensem Rs 3.50 per day	
II. Semi-skilled			
	Car Driver (other than private car	Rs 140.00 per mensem	
III. Clerical Staff			
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Junior Munshi Clerk (up to Matric) Clerk (Graduate) Accountant/Cashier Accountant (duly qualified)	Rs 100.00 per mensem Rs 100.00 per mensem Rs 120.00 per mensem Rs 130.00 per mensem Rs 175.00 per mensem	
IV. Supervisor Staff			
1. 2.	Depot Incharge Manager	Rs 150.00 per mensem	

R. I. N. AHOOJA, Secy.